

# Exhibit 24

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
2 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
3 633 West Fifth Street  
4 Suite 3600  
5 Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
bcaslin@jenner.com

6 Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
7 Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
8 353 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

12 *Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Visual  
13 Solutions America, Inc.*

14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 In Re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust  
18 Litigation

Case No. 14-cv-2058 SC

19 This Document Relates To:

MDL No. 1917

20 DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC DEFENDANTS'  
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DIRECT  
PURCHASER PLAINTIFF WETTSTEIN AND  
SONS, INC'S FIRST SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES TO MITSUBISHI  
DEFENDANTS**

23 Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Mitsubishi Electric  
2 Corporation (“MELCO”), Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc. (“MEUS”), and Mitsubishi Electric  
3 Visual Solutions America, Inc. (“MEVSA”) (collectively, the “Mitsubishi Electric Defendants”)  
4 hereby supplement their response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.’s First  
5 Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants (“DPPs’ Interrogatory” or “DPPs’  
6 Interrogatories”), served upon the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants by the Direct Purchaser  
7 Plaintiffs (“DPPs”) on December 19, 2014. This supplemental response incorporates the  
8 Mitsubishi Electric Defendants’ prior response from January 20, 2015.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL INTERROGATORIES**

11 1. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories, definitions, and  
12 instructions to the extent they purport to impose requirements beyond or inconsistent with the  
13 requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court’s Local Rules, or any other  
14 applicable rule or Court order.

15 2. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories as overbroad,  
16 unduly burdensome, and oppressive due to the significant burden and expense of responding to  
17 the Interrogatories and because the Interrogatories seek information that is not within any of the  
18 Mitsubishi Electric Defendant’s possession, custody or control, given that the information sought  
19 concerns products that the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants have not manufactured or sold for  
20 many years.

22 3. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories to the extent that  
23 they seek documents and information that would disclose any of the Mitsubishi Electric  
24

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 Defendants' or a third party's trade secrets or other confidential, proprietary, and/or highly-  
2 sensitive information.

3       4. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories to the extent that  
4 they seek disclosure of privileged information, including information protected by the attorney-  
5 client privilege, work-product doctrine, the joint defense privilege, or any other applicable  
6 privilege or immunity. Any inadvertent disclosure of privileged or protected documents,  
7 materials, or information shall not be construed as a waiver of any applicable privileges or  
8 protections.

9       10. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories to the extent that  
11 they seek discovery of information regarding or related to the sale of CRTs or finished products  
12 containing CRTs outside of the United States and unrelated to United States commerce, on the  
13 grounds that they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, and not reasonably calculated to  
14 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

15       16. In making these responses, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants do not concede the  
17 relevancy or materiality of any of the Plaintiff's Interrogatories.

18       19. Any response contained herein providing that information responsive to a  
20 particular interrogatory will be produced, subject to any applicable objections, is not a  
21 representation that such information exists.

22       23. The responses and/or objections contained herein do not in any way constitute an  
24 adoption of DPPs' purported definitions of words or phrases contained in the Interrogatories.  
25 The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definitions to the extent that they: (i) are vague,  
26 ambiguous, confusing, and/or overly broad; (ii) are inconsistent with the ordinary and customary

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 meaning of the words or phrases they purport to define; and/or (iii) incorporate other purported  
2 definitions that suffer from such defects. Without limiting the breadth and general application of  
3 these objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants further object to the definitions as follows:

- 4       a. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Co-Conspirator” to  
5           the extent it purports to suggest that any of the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants  
6           participated in a price-fixing conspiracy with the parties identified by the Plaintiff or  
7           any of the DPPs.
- 8       b. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Documents” to the  
9           extent it purports to include documents that are not reasonably accessible to any of  
10          the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants, or are beyond the scope of any applicable e-  
11           discovery obligations.
- 12      c. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Communication” on  
13           the grounds that the definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seeks  
14           information that is neither relevant to any claims or defenses in this litigation nor  
15           reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 16      d. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Meeting” on the  
17           grounds that the definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seeks  
18           information that is neither relevant to any claims or defenses in this litigation nor  
19           reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1                   **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO WETTSTEIN AND SON'S  
2                   FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

- 3) When did You first become aware of *In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation*, Case  
4 No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC (N.D. Cal.) (the "CRT Action")?

5                   **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by  
6 reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and  
7 without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state that they first became  
8 aware of *In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC (N.D. Cal.)  
9 (the "CRT Action") in or about January 2009.

- 10) What was Your policy on the destruction and/or retention of Documents and information  
11 at the time You learned of the CRT Action?

12                   **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by  
13 reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and  
14 without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants, respectively, state as  
15 follows:

16                   MEUS states that in or about January 2009, MEUS had a formal policy governing the  
17 retention of documents and information. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), MEUS refers the  
18 DPPs to ME 00148433 – ME 00148485.

19                   MEVSA states that in or about January 2009, MEVSA had a formal policy governing the  
20 retention of documents and information. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), MEVSA refers the  
21 DPPs to ME 00148633– ME 00148686.

22                   MELCO states that in or about January 2009, MELCO had formal corporate rules  
23 governing the retention and disposal of documents. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), MELCO  
24 refers the DPPs to ME 00148590 – ME 00148613.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

- 1           3)     What steps did You take to retain Documents and information after learning of the  
2                            *CRT Action?*

3                           **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by  
4                           reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and  
5                           without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state as follows:

6                           All document retention policies applicable to the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants  
7                           remained in place as of January 2009. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants did not take further  
8                           steps to retain documents and information upon first learning of the CRT Action in or about  
9                           January 2009, as they had no reason to believe they would be named in the CRT Action.

- 10                  5)     What was Your policy on the destruction and/or retention of Documents and  
11                           information at the time You entered into the Tolling Agreement Between the CRT  
12                           Class and Mitsubishi Electric Corporation and Mitsubishi Electric and Electronics  
13                           USA, Inc. (Nov. 7, 2011) (“Tolling Agreement”)?

14                           **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by  
15                           reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and  
16                           without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state, respectively, as  
17                           follows:

18                           MEUS and MEVSA state that after entering into the Tolling Agreement with the DPPs  
19                           on November 7, 2011, relevant personnel at MEUS and MEVSA were issued a “Suspension and  
20                           Preservation Notice/Litigation Hold” (“Hold Notice”) on November 11, 2011. The Hold Notice  
21                           required individuals subject to the Hold Notice to segregate and preserve all business records  
22                           relating to CRT-based products such as TVs and computer monitors, and to suspend scheduled  
23                           records destruction of such materials and/or business records. This Hold Notice was timely  
24                           supplemented during the course of the litigation.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 MELCO states that after entering into the Tolling Agreement with the DPPs on  
2 November 7, 2011, relevant personnel at MELCO were issued notice on November 9, 2011  
3 prohibiting the destruction or alteration of CRT-related documents and an extension of the  
4 minimum storage period ("MELCO Litigation Hold"). The MELCO Litigation Hold required  
5 individuals subject to it to segregate and preserve all business records relating to CRTs or CRT-  
6 based products such as TVs and computer monitors and to suspend scheduled records destruction  
7 of such materials and/or business records.

9 6) What steps did You take to retain Documents and information after You entered  
10 into the Tolling Agreement?

11 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants hereby  
12 incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein.  
13 Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state that for  
14 their supplemental response to this Interrogatory, they hereby incorporate by reference their  
15 supplemental response to DPPs' Interrogatory No. 5.

16 8) Please describe for the period 2005 to the present your systems and/or procedures,  
17 if any, for the automatic deletion of email or other electronically-stored  
18 information.

19 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants hereby  
20 incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein.  
21 Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants,  
22 respectively, state as follows:

23 MEUS and MEVSA state that during the Relevant Time Period, neither MEUS nor  
24 MEVSA had any systems or procedures for the automatic deletion of emails or other  
25 electronically stored information.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 MELCO states that during the Relevant Time Period MELCO did not have any systems  
2 or procedures for the automatic deletion of emails or other electronically stored information.  
3

4 Dated: July 28, 2015

5 Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric  
6 US, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions  
7 America, Inc.

8 By: /s/ Michael T. Brody

9 Michael T. Brody

10 Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
11 Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
12 Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
13 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
14 353 North Clark  
15 Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
16 Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West Fifth Street  
Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
bcaslin@jenner.com

17 *Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc., and Mitsubishi*  
*Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.*

**CONFIDENTIAL****VERIFICATION FOR MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORPORATION**I, Akihiko Moriya, declare and state:

I have read the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants' foregoing Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants and know its contents. The Supplemental Response is limited by the records and information in existence, presently recollected, and thus far discovered in the course of preparation of this Supplemental Response. Based thereon, I am informed and believe that the matters stated in this Supplemental Response are true and on that ground certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the same are true and correct.

Executed this 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2015 at Tokyo.

  
[NAME] Akihiko MORIYA

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1                   **VERIFICATION FOR MEUS AND MEVSA**  
2

3                   I, Yasuhiro Baba, declare and state:  
4

5                   I have read the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants' foregoing Supplemental Response to  
6 Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants  
7 and know its contents. The Supplemental Response is limited by the records and information in  
8 existence, presently recollected, and thus far discovered in the course of preparation of this Supplemental  
9 Response. Based thereon, I am informed and believe that the matters stated in this Supplemental  
10 Response are true and on that ground certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the  
11 United States of America that the same are true and correct.  
12

13                   Executed this 28th day of July, 2015 at Cypress, California, U.S.A.  
14

15                     
16                   Yasuhiro Baba  
17

1 Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
2 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
3 633 West Fifth Street  
4 Suite 3600  
5 Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
bcaslin@jenner.com

6 Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
7 Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
8 353 North Clark Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

12 *Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc., and Mitsubishi*  
13 *Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.*

14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 In Re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust  
18 Litigation

Case No. 14-cv-2058 SC

19 This Document Relates To:

MDL No. 1917

20 DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

## **Certificate of Service**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I caused a true and correct copy of the documents listed below to be served on July 28, 2015 via email to each of the persons as set forth on the attached service list.

- The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants' Supplemental Responses to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants
  - Mitsubishi Electric Corporation's Fourth Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a, Dash Computer's, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants Mitsubishi, Thomson, and TDA
  - Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a, Dash Computer's, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants Mitsubishi, Thomson, and TDA
  - Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a, Dash Computer's, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants Mitsubishi, Thomson, and TDA

Dated: July 28, 2015

By: /s/ Jory M. Hoffman

Jory M. Hoffman

**Service List**

<p>Philip J. Iovieno  Anne M. Nardacci  Boies, Schiller &amp; Flexner LLP  30 South Pearl St., 11th Floor  Albany, NY 12207  Telephone: (518) 434-0600  Facsimile: (518) 434-0665  piovieno@bsfllp.com  anardacci@bsfllp.com</p> <p>William Isaacson  Boies, Schiller &amp; Flexner LLP  5301 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Suite 800  Washington, D.C. 20015  Telephone: (202) 237-2727  Facsimile: (202) 237-6131  wisaacson@bsfllp.com</p> <p>Stuart Singer  Boies, Schiller &amp; Flexner LLP  401 East Las Olas Blvd., Suite 1200  Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  Telephone: (954) 356-0011  Facsimile: (954) 356-0022  ssinger@bsfllp.com</p> <p><i>Counsel for Electrograph Systems, Inc.,  Electrograph Technologies, Corp., Office  Depot, Inc., Interbond Corporation of  America, P.C. Richard &amp; Son Long  Island Corporation, Marta Cooperative  of America, Inc., ABC Appliance, Inc.,  Schultze Agency Services LLC on behalf  of Tweeter Opco, LLC and Tweeter  Newco, LLC</i></p>	<p>William J. Blechman  Richard A. Arnold  Samuel J Randall  Kenny Nachwalter PA  201 South Biscayne Blvd  Suite 1100  Miami, FL 33131  Telephone: (305) 373-1000  Fax: (305) 372-1861  wblechman@knpa.com  rarnold@kennynachwalter.com  srandall@knpa.com</p> <p>Kevin J. Murray  201 S. Biscayne Blvd.  Suite 1100  Miami, FL 33131  Telephone: (305)-373-1000  Fax: (305)-372-1861  kmurray@knpa.com</p> <p>Gavin David Whitis  Pond North LLP  350 South Grand Ave  Ste 3300  Los Angeles, CA 90071  Telephone: (415) 217-1240  Fax: (415) 394-0484  gwhitis@pondnorth.com</p> <p><i>Counsel for Sears, Roebuck and Co. and KMart  Corporation</i></p>
--	--

1	Kenneth S. Marks David M. Peterson John Pierre Lahad Johnny William Carter Jonathan Jeffrey Ross Susman Godfrey LLP 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100 Houston, TX 77002-5096 Telephone: (713) 651-9366 Fax: (713) 654-6666 kmarks@susmangodfrey.com dpeterson@susmangodfrey.com jlahad@susmangodfrey.com jcarter@susmangodfrey.com jross@susmangodfrey.com	Roman Silberfeld David Martinez Jill Sharon Casselman Robins Kaplan Miller & Ciresi LLP 2049 Century Park East Suite 3400 Los Angeles, CA 90067-3208 Telephone: (310) 552-0130 Fax: (310) 229-5800 rmsilberfeld@rkmc.com
2	<i>Counsel for Alfred H. Siegel, as Trustee of Circuit City Stores, Inc. Liquidating Trust</i>	Elliot S. Kaplan K. Craig Wildfang Laura Elizabeth Nelson Robins Kaplan Miller and Ciresi 2800 LaSalle Plaza 800 LaSalle Ave Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: (612) 349-0986 Fax: (612) 339-4181 eskaplan@rkmc.com kcwildfang@rkmc.com lenelson@rkmc.com
3		<i>Counsel for Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Purchasing LLC; Best Buy Enterprise Services, Inc.; Best Buy Stores, L.P.; BestBuy.com, LLC; and Magnolia Hi-Fi, Inc.</i>
4	Cori Gordon Moore David Burman Eric J. Weiss Nicholas H. Hesterberg Perkins Coie LLP 1201 Third Avenue Suite 4800 Seattle, WA 98101-3099 Telephone: (206) 359-8000 Fax: (206) 359-4849 cgmoore@perkinscoie.com dburman@perkinscoie.com eweiss@perkinscoie.com nhesterberg@perkinscoie.com	Scott N. Wagner Wendy Polit Robert Turken Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP 200 S. Biscayne Boulevard Suite 2500 Miami, FL 33131 Telephone: 305-350-7386 swagner@bilzin.com wpolit@bilzin.com rturken@bilzin.com
5	Joren Surya Bass	<i>Attorneys for Tech Data Corp.</i>
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 Perkins Coie 2 Four Embarcadero Center 3 Suite 2400 4 San Francisco, CA 94111 5 Telephone: (415) 344-7000 6 jbass@perkinscoie.com  <i>Counsel for Costco Wholesale Corporation</i>	
7 Debra Dawn Bernstein 8 Michael P. Kenny 9 Melissa Whitehead 10 Alston & Bird LLP 11 1201 West Peachtree Street 12 Atlanta, GA 30309 13 404-881-7000 14 Fax: 404-253-8488 15 debra.bernstein@alston.com 16 Mike.Kenny@alston.com 17 Debra.Bernstein@alston.com 18 Melissa.Whitehead@alston.com  19 James Matthew Wagstaffe 20 Kerr & Wagstaffe LLP 21 101 Missions Street, 18th Floor 22 San Francisco, CA 94105-1528 23 415-371-8500 24 Fax: 415-371-0500 25 Email: wagstaffe@kerrwagstaffe.com  26 <i>Attorneys for Dell, Inc., and Dell Products, L.P.</i>	7 Guido Saveri 8 Cadio Zirpoli 9 Rick Saveri 10 Saveri & Saveri, Inc. 11 706 Sansome Street 12 San Francisco, CA 94111 13 Telephone: 415-217-6810 14 Fax: 415-217-6813 15 Guido@saveri.com 16 Cadio@saveri.com 17 rick@saveri.com  18